

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

**Leseman, LLC,**

**No. 14-CV-363 (SRN/SER)**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**ORDER**

**Stratasys, Inc.,**

**Defendant**

---

Devan V. Padmanabhan, Sri K. Sankaran, Erin O. Dungan, Nadeem W. Schwen, and Paul Robbennolt, Winthrop & Weinstine, P.A., 225 South Sixth Street, Suite 3500, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, on behalf of Plaintiff

Timothy Grimsrud, Kenneth Liebman, Lauren M.W. Steinhäuser, Linzey A. Erickson, and Jeya Paul, Faegre Baker Daniels, LLP, 90 South Seventh Street, Suite 2200, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, on behalf of Defendant

---

SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, District Judge

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Leseman, LLC's ("Leseman's") Letter Request for Clarification and a Stay [Doc. No. 96]. In Leseman's May 31, 2016 letter to the Court, Leseman indicates that it is prepared to propose a stipulation of noninfringement with respect to a certain limitation or limitations in the accused device. (Pl.'s Letter of 5/31/16 at 1 [Doc. No. 73].) However, the parties disagree about whether the Court's construction of the "and" limitation in the claim construction ruling provides an independent basis for noninfringement. (*Id.*) (citing Order of 5/17/16 at 22-25 [Doc.

No. 95].) Leseman seeks clarification of the term “and,” as it relates to timing, in order to propose an appropriate stipulation. (Id.) In addition, Leseman asks that the Court cancel all pending deadlines, including the trial date, pending the requested clarification and preparation of a stipulation of noninfringement. (Id.)

Defendant Stratasys, Inc. (“Stratasys”) opposes Plaintiff’s request. Stratasys argues that there is no need for clarification, as the Court’s construction is clear. (Def.’s Letter of 6/1/16 at 1.) Stratasys contends that the Court’s May 17, 2016 Order answers Leseman’s timing question regarding the construction of “and.” (Id. at 1-2.) Defendant further opposes Plaintiff’s request as an attempt to seek reconsideration of arguments previously rejected by the Court. (Id. at 2.) As to Leseman’s request for a stay, while Stratasys is hopeful that the parties may stipulate to noninfringement, Stratasys finds that it would be premature to cancel all pending deadlines at this time. (Id.)

For the reasons stated in Defendant’s June 1, 2016 letter, summarized above, Plaintiff’s request is denied. The May 17, 2016 Order is clear; no clarification is necessary. Plaintiff’s request for a stay is also denied until such time as a stipulation is filed.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that

1. Plaintiff Leseman, LLC’s Letter Request for Clarification and a Stay [Doc. No. 96] is **DENIED**.

Dated: June 6, 2016

s/Susan Richard Nelson  
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON  
United States District Court Judge